



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE LATEST RESEARCHES ON PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA.

THE great advance which historical science has made in this century is likewise to be witnessed in the study of Philo of Alexandria. While in former centuries people occupied themselves but very little with Philo, he has now for some time been zealously studied, and his doctrines and writings are being thoroughly examined in every direction. Philosophers and theologians have equal interest in an exact investigation of Philo's teaching. As the culmination of Judæo-Alexandrian religious philosophy, Philo marks an important stage in the history of ancient philosophy, the latest systems of which are incomprehensible without a knowledge of Philonic doctrine. But by reason of his intimate connection with the sacred literature of the Jews, and his unmistakable influence upon the origin and the older literature of Christianity, the study of his philosophy will always remain indispensable for theologians, both Jewish and Christian. In the most recent times philologists also, and with good reason, have begun to direct their attention to him. As one of the best writers of the Hellenistic period he did not deserve to remain so long neglected by them. It is, however, partly due to the uncritical treatment of his text that Philo has hitherto been often misunderstood, and not met with due appreciation.

It is not my purpose to give here a complete account of all the literature bearing on Philo.¹ This literature is of such vast extent that an exhaustive treatment would

¹ A good survey of the literature until the year 1885 is given by E. Schürer in his *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes zur Zeit Jesu Christi*, Vol. II. (Leipzig, 1886), p. 831 *seq.*

occupy a space out of all proportion to its usefulness. I only intend to report upon the present condition of research and upon the most recent labours, and to show what progress has been made of late years in our knowledge of Philo, at the same time pointing out how much still remains to be done by learned inquirers. Only by the co-operation of many forces can the solution of the numerous important problems be achieved. In particular, I would here earnestly exhort all those who are well versed in Jewish literature to occupy themselves more with Philo than has hitherto been done. They will find in him a profitable field of labour.

The first efforts at a complete presentation of the *philosophy* of Philo were the works of Gfrörer and Dähne.¹ Both of these, meritorious as they were in their time, must still be on the whole considered as failures. Both writers approached Philo with preconceived opinions and with a decided tendency; both were less concerned in interpreting Philo himself out of his writings than in explaining the origin of Christianity from Philo. By this method it was of course impossible for them to succeed in obtaining a just estimate of Philo.² Similarly, what they assert concerning the origin of the Judæo-Alexandrian religious philosophy, and its traces in the pre-Philonic Jewish Hellenistic literature, is almost throughout incorrect. It is a totally perverse notion to regard the translation of the LXX. as produced under the influence of Greek philosophy. Of all the writings of the Judæo-Hellenistic literature which arose before Philo, the *Wisdom of Solomon* is (Aristobulus apart) the only one in which the influence of Greek philosophy can be clearly traced. The first genuinely scientific presentation of the Philonic philosophy was given by Ed. Zeller

¹ Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1831). Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, 2 vols. (Halle, 1834).

² See Freudenthal, Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1869, p. 411 *seq.*

in the standard work, "Die Philosophie der Griechen."¹ With admirable lucidity and vividness, Zeller describes how Philo, starting from the Jewish belief in revelation and adhering strictly to it, but on the other hand filled with the Hellenic spirit and convinced of the great worth of Hellenic culture, sought by means of allegorical explanation of the actual words of the Bible to harmonise the religion of Judaism with Greek speculation, and thereby created a philosophical system, which, full though it be of contradictions and obscurities, still manifests an individual and independent character, and must be recognised as an essential link in the development of Greek philosophy. In the introductory remarks, too, concerning the origin of the Judæo-Alexandrian philosophy, and the real and alleged traces of Greek influence in the Judæo-Hellenistic literature, Zeller's keen and impartial judgment is seen. Only in regard to the Essenes does he cling, even in his third edition, to the erroneous opinion that they were a product of the influence of neo-Pythagoreanism upon Judaism. This view, in my opinion, cannot hold its ground; the Essenes were a purely Jewish sect, a society in which the Jewish laws of purity were practised with the utmost rigour, and carried to an exaggerated extreme.

Besides Zeller's, we have now the delineation of James Drummond.² Dr. Drummond's work is a highly meritorious production based upon a thorough knowledge of Philo. In impartiality and objectivity, his treatment of the subject is not inferior to Zeller's, while he excels the German scholar in fulness. Both works, of course, deal only with the philosophical contents of the Philonic writings. In both reference is made, in the case of the most important teachings, to the Greek sources from which Philo preferentially drew. Philo was notoriously eclectic; in

¹ Part 3, Section 2 (3rd edition 1881), pp. 338-418.

² *Philo-Judeus, or the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy in its development and completion*, by James Drummond, 2 vols. (London, 1888).

the philosophical teachings which he derives from the words of the Bible he follows first one, then the other school. He has drawn most abundantly from Plato (doctrine of ideas, creation), and from the Stoics (doctrine of the Logos, Ethics); in his symbolism of numbers he attaches himself to the Pythagorean (or the Pythagorising Stoic) school; but he has also borrowed much from the Peripatetic philosophy, and occasionally even did not disdain the teachings of the Sceptics. Philo's dependence upon different schools of philosophy requires to be more minutely investigated and established, for the better understanding of the various parts of his system and of some of his works. In this respect the first attempts only have hitherto been made. It is chiefly the doctrine of the Logos that has formed the subject of special investigation.¹ Philo's theory of knowledge has lately been treated by a young Breslau scholar, Max Freudenthal.² If the various writings are more closely investigated with an eye to their philosophic contents, many not unimportant results for the history of the philosophy of the Hellenistic period may thereby be gained. J. Bernays gave an example of this in his unfortunately unfinished commentary on the *Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου*.³ Hans von Arnim's book contains a thorough examination of the sources.⁴ It consists of three treatises. In the first the contents of the *Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου* are analysed; in the second it is shown that Philo, in the section of the *De*

¹ Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie*, pp. 204-297 (Leipsic, 1872); Soulier, *La doctrine du Logos chez Philon d'Alexandrie* (Turin, 1876); Réville, *Le Logos d'après Philon d'Alexandrie* (Genève, 1877); *La doctrine du Logos dans le quatrième évangile et dans les œuvres de Philon* (Paris, 1881).

² Max Freudenthal, *Die Erkenntnislehre Philos von Alexandria* (Berlin, 1891).

³ *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften (Philos. Hist. Classe, 1882)*.

⁴ Hans von Arnim, *Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria* (Berlin, 1888).

Ebrietas (Mang. I. 383-388), which deals with the untrustworthiness of sensuous perceptions, made use of the well-known *τρόποι* of the sceptic Aenesidemus, to which, moreover, one passage of the book *De Vita Josephi* (Mang. II. 59) is referred; in the third treatise Arnim deals with the Stoic problem, *εἰ μεθυσθήσεται ὁ σοφός*, discussed by Philo in his work *De Plantatione Noe* (Mang. I. 350-356). It is greatly to be desired that more of such investigations were set on foot; then in time it could be precisely determined in how far Philo, in his philosophical views, is dependent upon Greek philosophy, and to what extent he is original.

The philosophical teachings of Philo show us the author from one side only, viz., that on which he appears most closely united to Hellenism. The other side of the Philonic literature is the *theological*, from which he approaches us as a professor and defender of Judaism. Philo is not only a philosopher, but in a still higher degree a writer on religion and a Bible exegete. Few of his writings are purely philosophical; most of them are in their essence expository works on the Bible, philosophical teachings, which, in reality, have grown up on Greek soil, and been attached to the words of Holy Writ. The kind of exegesis of which Philo mostly made use, was, as is well known, the method of allegory. This system of exegesis was not invented by Philo; long before his time it was practised by the Greeks as well as by the Jews. The Stoics employed allegory in their explanation of the Homeric poems, and in the interpretation of the Greek myths of gods and heroes; by aid of allegorical explanation they sought to indicate that their own philosophical teachings were already displayed in Homer and in the ancient myths. Among the men of his own faith also, Philo had forerunners in the art of allegorical interpretation. He himself testifies to this, for in his explanation of passages in Scripture he frequently appeals to older exegetes, and adduces at times various interpretations of a single

Biblical passage which point to well-known traditions. He further reports that in the societies of the Essenes and Therapeutæ the Biblical writings used to be explained allegorically. Besides this, we know that, before Philo, Aristobulus sought, by means of allegorical interpretations, to trace doctrines of Greek philosophy in the Jewish religion.

To Philo's Bible exegesis many weighty problems are attached. The first question is—What is Philo's relation to the Septuagint? It is certain that Philo did not make use of the Hebrew text of the Holy Scripture, but of the Greek translation by the LXX. True, he was not quite unacquainted with Hebrew, as we can infer from his etymologies of Hebrew expressions, but he was not so conversant with it as with Greek; he, therefore, preferred to base his exegesis upon the translation of the LXX., commonly employed by the Alexandrian Jews, ascribing to it the same sanctity and binding force as to the Hebrew original. As Philo is the earliest writer who made use of the LXX., which he frequently quotes, it is evident how high a value his citations and interpretations have for the criticism and the restoration of the original form of the Septuagint, the text of which has, in the course of time, undergone so many changes and disfigurements. We can, in fact, perceive that Philo, in certain passages, had before him another and better text of the Greek translation, than is offered by the extant MSS. and editions of the Septuagint. I will only quote one example. The text of the Septuagint, Gen. iii. 24, is, *καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ κατόκισεν αὐτὸν ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς καὶ ἔταξεν τὰ χερουβὶμ καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην φυλάσσειν τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς*. Here, owing to the additions of *αὐτὸν* and *καὶ ἔταξεν*, which are not found in the Hebrew text, the meaning of the sentence is completely altered. But Philo, in *De Cherubim* 4 (I. p. 140), reproduces this sentence in the modified form, *τότε καὶ ἡ φλογίνη ῥομφαία καὶ τὰ χερουβὶμ ἀντικρὺ τοῦ παραδείσου τὴν οἴκησιν ἴσχει*. Hence

we must assume that Philo, in his copy of the Septuagint, read καὶ κατ'ᾠκισεν ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς τὰ χειρουβὶμ καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥουφαίαν, i.e., exactly in accordance with the Masoretic text. On the Bible quotations in Philo, Zach. Frankel, in his learned and ingenious writings on the Septuagint,¹ has incidentally made several observations. C. Siegfried² has collected Philo's Bible quotations and compared them with the text of the Septuagint. But a final solution of the question has not been brought about, and, indeed, has not hitherto been possible. For the text of Philo as presented in existing editions is not trustworthy; frequently the Biblical citations have not the same form in which Philo wrote them; they have been altered, partly by the copyists of the MSS. and partly by the editors, to bring them into agreement with the accepted text of the Septuagint. From the oldest traditional sources, however, the correct reading can at times be restored. Philo's relation to the Septuagint will only be accurately determined when the new edition of his works, with the text emended according to the best MSS., lies before us.

Z. Frankel was the first to duly recognise and correctly represent the true character of Philo's interpretation of the Bible, and its sharp contrast to the Palestinian exegesis.³ But notwithstanding this essential difference in the conception and explanation of Holy Writ, we still find points of contact between Philo and Palestinian works. Not a few of Philo's allegorical interpretations are to be met with in the Midrashim (Bereshit Rabba, Jalkut, etc.). Here arises the important question: Has Philo drawn from the Palestinian Midrash, or have Philonic ideas and

¹ *Vorstudien zu der S'ptuaginta* (Leipsic, 1841); *Ueber den Einfluss der Palaestinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipsic, 1851).

² *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1873).

³ *Ueber palästinische und alexandrinische Schriftforschung* (Programm. Breslau, 1854).

expositions passed over into the Midrashim? To answer this question, a thorough investigation is needed into the origin, sources and dates of the Midrashim. It were greatly to be desired that those learned in Talmudic literature should apply themselves to this important task. A few parallels from Midrashic literature C. Siegfried has collected in his book on Philo. This learned work¹ is a most valuable contribution to the exegesis of Philo, and to the history of his influence upon later literature. The first part of the book treats of the rules of the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, and then gives a complete view of the teaching of Philo according to his allegorical explanations. In the second part Siegfried discusses Philo's influence upon later Jewish, and particularly upon Christian literature (New Testament and Church-fathers). Obviously, however, the section on Philo's relation to Hebrew literature requires, after what has been said above, to be considerably supplemented. The introduction contains among other things an industriously collected, but still very incomplete Philonic glossary.

As the allegorical method of exposition preponderates in the Philonic writings, we find, upon bringing the Palestinian religious sources into comparison, that Philo occupies himself chiefly with that element of the Talmudic literature which it is customary to sum up under the term *Agada*. The Philonic writings represent, so to speak, the Alexandrian *Agada*. But the other side of the Talmudic literature, the *Halacha* is, likewise, not altogether absent in Philo. It is to be met with in those writings in which the allegorical is pushed into the background by the historico-ethical explanation, especially in the work *De specialibus legibus*, in which Philo interprets in systematic fashion the Mosaic legislation. The relation of Philo to the Palestinian

¹ Carl Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des alten Testaments an sich selbst und nach seinem geschichtlichen Einfluss betrachtet*. (Jena, 1875.)

Halacha B. Ritter has made clear in an able monograph.¹ Philo does not simply offer a paraphrase to the Biblical laws; in his representation and exposition he frequently travels beyond the letter of the Mosaic ordinances. It is not to be assumed that such expansions of the Biblical commands were invented by Philo himself; it is much more probable that they were founded upon a particular tradition or upon the actual practice then in vogue in Egypt. Some of the legal decisions mentioned by Philo which do not directly follow from the Bible, occur also, as Ritter proves, in the Palestinian *Halacha*. On the other hand, however, there are also decisions in which Philo diverges from the Talmudic sources. In these cases, too, we have probably no mere subjective opinions of Philo. The presumption was entertained by Z. Frankel, that in Egypt, in many cases, different usages may have prevailed from those which obtained in Palestine. Ritter is of the same opinion, and not without justification refers back many of those laws in Philo which are not in accord with the Palestinian *Halacha*, to decisions and ordinances of the Jewish Synhedrion of Alexandria.

We now come to the literary and historical works on Philo, and will, in the first place, state the results which have recently been arrived at, concerning the order and classification of the Philonic writings. A definite tradition of the order and sequence of the Philonic works does not exist. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 18), it is true, gives a list of the writings of Philo, but it is so confused that we can make no practical use of it as a systematic arrangement. In the MSS., the sequence of the writings is entirely different, and nowhere is any definite system of arrangement recognisable. We must, therefore, endeavour to supply a proper division and sequence, according to the contents of his writings. The first editor, Adrianus

¹ *Philo und die Halacha. Eine vergleichende Studie unter steter Berücksichtigung des Josephus.* (Leipsic, 1879.)

Turnebus, already attempted to introduce some order in the confusion, and to group together writings of similar import, but with no marked success. Far better is the arrangement and sequence of the writings in Mangey's edition, which to the present time remains of paramount authority. During this century, valuable contributions to the correct classification of the works of Philo have been supplied by Gfrörer (see p. 25, note 1 above), Dähne,¹ Grossmann,² Ewald,³ and quite recently by Schürer and Massebieau.⁴ I here briefly summarise the most important results yielded by these treatises. Speaking in general terms, three great categories can be distinguished in the works of Philo, viz., writings on the exposition of the Pentateuch, historico-apologetic writings, and philosophical writings. The first group is the most comprehensive, embracing more than three-quarters of the Philonic writings.

I. *Exegetical Writings on the Pentateuch.*—For the explanation of the Pentateuch, Philo composed three great works, each of which is again divided into several books.

1. *Quæstiones et Solutiones* (*Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*), a short explanation of the Bible according to the literal sense (*τὸ ῥητόν*, ad litteram), and the allegorical sense (*πρὸς διάνοιαν*, ad mentem), in the form of question and answer. Of this work, Eusebius mentions eleven books, six books on Genesis, and five on Exodus. The Greek original is lost; we know the work chiefly through an Armenian translation, which was edited by Aucher, together with a Latin translation (Venice, 1826). The Armenian translation contains four books on Genesis (ii.—xxviii.), and two books on Exodus (xii. 2—23, and xx. 25—xxviii. 38.) The four books on Genesis correspond probably to the six

¹ *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1833, pages 984-1040.

² *De Philonis Judæi operum continua serie et ordine chronologico*, I, II. (Leipsic, 1841, 1842.)

³ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3rd edition, vol. vi., pages 257-312.

⁴ *Le Classement des Œuvres de Philon*. (Paris, 1889.)

books of Eusebius, the fourth book on Genesis containing no doubt also the fifth and sixth mentioned by Eusebius. The two books on Exodus are very likely the same as the second and fifth of the five books referred to by Eusebius. This work was much used in the Middle Age by the Church-fathers and in anthologies; hence it is possible to restore the Greek text in many sections.

2. *The great Allegorical Commentary on Genesis* (Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορία).—In this work allegory rules exclusively; by allegorising the events narrated in Genesis, Philo gives us a history of the human soul, a system of psychology and ethics, the aim of which is the union of the human soul with God. Of all Philo's works this is the most comprehensive; to it belong all the writings which are printed in the first volume of Mangey's edition (with the exception of *De Opificio Mundi*): *Legum Allegoriarum* lib. I., II., III., *De Cherubim*, *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*, *De posteritate Caini*, *De Gigantibus*, *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*, *De Agricultura*, *De Plantatione Noe*, *De Ebrietate* (consisted originally of two books, the second, with the exception of a few fragments, being lost), *De Sobrietate*, *De Confusione Linguarum*, *De Migratione Abrahami*, *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres sit*, *De Congressu quærendæ eruditionis gratia*, *De Profugis*, *De Mutatione Nominum*, *De Deo* (only preserved in the Armenian translation), *De Somniis*, lib. I., II. (the last named originally contained, as Eusebius shows, five books, of which the first three are lost). On the origin of these writings, and their true character, Ewald and Frankel were the first to express the correct view, which was then more minutely expounded and defended by Prof. Freudenthal.¹ All writings belonging to this work probably proceeded from religious discourses which Philo delivered on the Jewish festivals to assemblies in Alexandria, and which he later worked out in connected

¹ Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft (Breslau, 1869), pp. 7—9, 137—141.

commentaries. This circumstance explains also the manifold points of contact with the Palestinian Midrashim, which likewise had their origin in religious discourses.

3. *The Presentation of the Mosaic Legislation.*—In this historico-exegetic work Philo expounds the Mosaic ordinances chiefly according to their literal sense, without, however, excluding the allegorical method of interpretation. The work may be divided into three parts. By way of introduction, Philo gives an account of the Biblical narrating of the creation, which Moses, according to Philo, intentionally placed at the head of his legislation. Thereupon follow the biographies of the patriarchs, and then the exposition of the Mosaic legislation. To this work, accordingly, belong the following writings:—*De Opificio Mundi*, *De Abrahamo*,¹ *De Josepho*, *De Decalogo*, *De Specialibus Legibus*. The work, *De Specialibus Legibus*, treats in full detail of the Ten Commandments, and is divided into four books: in the first book the first and second commandments are dealt with; in the second book, the third, fourth, and fifth; in the third book, the sixth and seventh; in the fourth, the eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments. To these four books certain writings are to be assigned which have hitherto been mostly known under special titles. To the first book belong: *De Circumcisione*, *De Monarchia*, lib. I., II., *De Præmiis Sacerdotum*, *De Victimis*, *De Victimæ Offerentibus*. Of the second book, only fragments are to be found in the ordinary editions; the complete text was first edited by Tischendorf (Philonea, Leipsic, 1868) from the Florentine MS. To the fourth book, which Mangey first edited in full from an Oxford MS., belong also the sections *De Judice*, *De Concupiscentia*, *De Justitia*, *De Creatione Principum*, and as appendix, *De Fortitudine*, *De Præmiis et Pænis*, *De Execrationibus*.

¹ In the same manner, Philo appears to have described the lives of Isaac and Jacob, of which books, however, nothing has been preserved.

II. *Historico-Apologetic Writings*.—The writings of the first category appealed almost exclusively to Jewish readers. On the other hand, the writings which we sum up in these two groups were destined for a wider circle of readers. In them Philo has an apologetic object in view; he wishes to make the Greeks acquainted with the moral teachings of Judaism, and to defend the Jewish religion against the attacks of its opponents. The allegorical method of interpretation is not made use of in these writings. The following works belong to this group:—

1. The books, *De Vita Mosis*, a panegyric on Moses as leader of the people, as lawgiver, priest, and prophet. A few short tractates, *De Caritate*, *De Pœnitentia*, *De Nobilitate*, form an appendix to this work. One treatise, *De Pietate* (*Περὶ εὐσεβείας*), to which reference is made at the commencement of *De Caritate*, is lost. In one part of the MSS., the work *De Fortitudine* is connected with the dissertations *De Caritate* and *De Pœnitentia*, and Schürer attempts to justify this connection. On the other hand, Gfrörer and Dähne, and lately, Massebieau, have convincingly demonstrated that *De Fortitudine* is more naturally connected with *De Justitia*, and, therefore, belongs to the work, *De Specialibus Legibus*.

2. The writings *Contra Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Caium*.—Philo's account of the persecution under Caligula has not come down to us in a complete form. According to Eusebius, the work consisted of five books; the larger part is, therefore, lost.

3. Two works of Philo, concerning which we have information only through quotations in Eusebius—the *Ῥποθετικά* and *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* (or *Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων*)—were likewise of apologetic character. From the *Ῥποθετικά* Eusebius quotes a fragment, in which Philo refutes the erroneous opinions of opponents on the origin of the Jewish nation, and gives a short abstract of the Mosaic laws. From the *Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων* Eusebius quotes Philo's

account of the Essenes. Massebieau conjectures that the writing, *De Vita Contemplativa*, formed originally a constituent part of this *Ἀπολογία*. I shall return to this work later on.

III. *Philosophical Writings*.—In these works Philo discusses specific philosophical problems quite in the manner of the Greek philosophers of his time, without reference to the Bible and without giving any prominence to his Jewish belief. Only in a few incidental remarks on the Jews, or in a short quotation from the Bible, does the Jewish religion of the author come into evidence. It is very probable that these are writings of Philo's early youth; that they date from a period when Philo, still occupied with his own intellectual and moral development, zealously applied himself to the study of Greek philosophy, and when he had not yet arrived at that independent *Weltanschauung* which was the offspring of a union of the Jewish belief in revelation with Greek philosophy. This accounts for the circumstance that certain external defects attach to these writings which we do not observe in the other works of Philo. To this group the following writings belong:—1. *Quod omnis probus liber sit* (*Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον ἐλεύθερον εἶναι*)—the continuation of a lost work which Eusebius mentions, in which the converse proposition was proved (*περὶ τοῦ πάντα φαῦλον δοῦλον εἶναι*). 2. *De Æternitate mundi* (*Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου*)—a work to which J. Bernays has devoted considerable labour, and which has recently been edited by Franz Cumont (Berlin, 1891). 3. *De Providentia* (*Περὶ προνοίας*), preserved, as a whole, only in an Armenian translation consisting of two books, though the first book exists apparently not quite in its original form, but in a Christian revision. Two larger Greek fragments have come down to us from Eusebius. 4. *Alexander, sive de Animalibus* (*Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα*), also preserved only in the Armenian translation. The two last-named writings are in dialogue form.

The genuineness of some of Philo's writings has of late years been strongly contested. The greatest amount of doubt has been cast upon the authenticity of the work, *De Vita Contemplativa*, which deals with the Therapeutæ, because it was not believed that such an ascetic sect could have existed in the time of Philo. The view that the Therapeutæ were not Jews, but Christians, is very old, and was predominant during the whole of the Middle Ages till modern times. Since Eusebius, all the Church fathers and theologians regarded the Therapeutæ as Christian monks. As, however, Philo was known as the author of *De Vita Contemplativa*, a legend was invented for the explanation of this contradiction, to the effect that Philo met the apostle Peter in Rome (as Seneca is alleged to have met Paul), and through him became acquainted with Christianity. After Protestant criticism had overthrown this legend, opinions on the Therapeutæ became divided. Some considered them as representatives of a philosophic tendency in Judaism, called forth by the Alexandrian philosophy; another identified them with the Essenes, describing them, so to speak, as Egyptian Essenes. Some, however, wished to deny to the Therapeutæ all historic reality, and regarded the work, *De Vita Contemplativa*, as a romance. But, during the most recent times, the opinion of the Church fathers, that the Therapeutæ were Christian ascetics, has been again revived, and, as a consequence, the Philonic authorship of the *De Vita Contemplativa* had to be denied. Professor Graetz¹ was the first to assert the unauthenticity of this work, and he pronounced the Therapeutæ to be Christian ascetics of the second or third century after Christ, and the *De Vita Contemplativa* to be the work of a Christian belonging to the Gnostic or Montanistic circle, who wished to idealise the ascetic mode of life. At the same time others also took up their stand against Philo's authorship, although they did not exactly

¹ *Geschichte der Juden*, Vol. III. (2nd edition), p. 463, seq.

declare the Therapeutæ to be Christians. Nicolas¹ was of opinion that *De Vita Contemplativa* was written by a Jew living at the end of the third century, whose enthusiasm for ascetic life, and envy of Christian ascetics, induced him to set up an ideal image of Jewish asceticism. In the same manner, Kuenen² considered *De Vita Contemplativa* a romance of the third century.

The view expressed by Professor Graetz was defended in the fullest manner and with extraordinary learning and ingenuity by P. E. Lucius.³ Lucius asserted *De Vita Contemplativa* to be an apology of Christian asceticism, written in the third century under Philo's name. His demonstration appeared so convincing, that the ancient controversy was then deemed finally settled. In Germany, Lucius' theory received the unconditional assent of most scholars, men like Zeller, Schürer, Harnack, and others. In spite of all this, his view must be pronounced to have been mistaken. L. Massebieau, in an excellent essay,⁴ has most successfully defended the genuineness of *De Vita Contemplativa* against Lucius' attack. By means of an exact analysis, resting upon a thorough knowledge of Philo, and by comparison with Philo's other writings, he has shown that *De Vita Contemplativa* moves throughout in the Philonic circle of ideas, and is nowhere opposed to Philo's philosophic opinions. The style is so completely Philonic that not one word occurs that is not used, or might not well have been used by him, while in the whole book there is scarcely a sentence which could not be supported by parallels from the other writings of Philo. This circumstance, if the work is authentic, has nothing remark-

¹ *Revue de Théologie* (Strasburg, 1868), p. 25, *seq.*

² *De Godsdienst van Israël*, Vol. II., p. 440, *seq.*

³ *Die Therapeuten und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der Askese.* (Strasburg, 1879.)

⁴ *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. XVI. (1887), pp. 170-198, 284-319.

able in it, as Philo shows a fondness for repeating again and again the same ideas in the same words; it would, however, be inexplicable on the contrary hypothesis. An imitation is always in some way or other distinguishable from an original work. *De Vita Contemplativa* differs in nothing from the other writings of Philo. That any one (and especially a Christian author of the third century) should have constructed out of diverse sentences and ideas of Philo a piece of mosaic in a manner so ingenious as to render it, in regard both to contents and style, undistinguishable from an authentic work of Philo's, is an impossible assumption. That under the Therapeutæ Christian ascetics are depicted, is not proved by the references of Lucius to Patristic literature. In the description of the Therapeutæ there is nothing to prevent us from regarding them as a Jewish sect. While they differed from the great mass of Jews in many peculiarities of external life, in their religious views they did not separate themselves from those who were faithful followers of the law. It was precisely in Egypt, the home of the New-Pythagorean-Orphic mysticism, where the birth of a similar tendency in Judaism is not surprising. Lucius adduces as a proof of the unauthenticity of the work, that before Eusebius the Therapeutæ are nowhere mentioned. An *argumentum ex silentio* has always something suspicious about it; in this case it is quite inadmissible. There are facts enough in the history of mankind, and among them many more remarkable than the existence of the Therapeutæ, for which we have only *one* witness, but which nevertheless admit of no doubt. For upon whom lay a necessity to make any mention of the Therapeutæ? Josephus might perhaps have referred to them in passing, but it was not necessary for him to do so, as he concerned himself little with the condition of the Egyptian Jews. Perhaps, also, in his time there were no longer any Therapeutæ, and it is doubtful whether he was acquainted with all the writings of Philo.

Still less had Greek and Roman writers cause to speak of a small society among the Jewish inhabitants of Egypt.

That the Church fathers, who lived before Eusebius, never mentioned the sect of Therapeutæ, certainly appears remarkable. But either they did not know the work *De Vita Contemplativa*—for we need not take for granted that the writings of Philo were as familiar to all of them as to Eusebius—or they saw in the Therapeutæ nothing more than they really were, a Jewish brotherhood, and therefore considered that they had no occasion to concern themselves with them; while Eusebius, who drew up a complete inventory of the Philonic writings, thought he could recognise in the Therapeutæ Christian ascetics, and therefore treated of them with much minuteness. In one point only was Lucius right, viz., in regard to the relation of the treatise on the Therapeutæ to the work *Quod omnis probus liber sit*. The work *De Vita Contemplativa* begins with the words:—Ἑσσαιῶν περί διαλεχθείς, οἱ τὸν πρακτικὸν ἐξήλωσαν καὶ διεπόνησαν βίον . . . αὐτίκα καὶ περὶ τῶν θεωρίαν ἀσπασαμένων ἀκολουθία τῆς πραγματείας ἐπόμενος τὰ προσήκοντα λέξω. It therefore presents itself as a pendant and continuation to a treatise on the Essenes. These words have generally been referred to the work *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, in which in one passage (§ 12, 13) the Essenes are spoken of, and in the editions, as well as in most of the MSS., the two writings are found side by side. Lucius quite correctly remarks that the connection is a forced and unnatural one. For *Quod omnis probus liber sit* does not exclusively depict the practical life of the Essenes (as *De Vita Contemplativa* depicts the theoretical life of the Therapeutæ), but discusses the philosophical theory that only the wise man is free, and only among other examples incidentally makes mention of the Essenes. The connection is also impossible for this reason: *Quod omnis probus liber sit* was probably a youthful work of Philo, while the other treatise on the Therapeutæ must have been composed many years later, as Philo's fully

formed and worked out philosophic doctrines are already to be found in it. Philo must have dealt with the Essenes in another work, in which he described them as an example of *πρακτικὸς βίος*, and the companion picture thereto was formed by the treatise on the Therapeutæ, whom Philo depicts as representatives of *θεωρητικὸς βίος*. But that Philo spoke of the Essenes in another place also is expressly certified by Eusebius. From one of Philo's lost works, *Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων*, Eusebius quotes a fragment which treats of the Essenes. Massebieau conjectures, with great probability, that the tractate on the Therapeutæ also belonged originally to this apologetic work, but having afterwards become detached from it, was henceforward handed down as a separate treatise, while the remaining portions of the work were lost.

Some have also attempted to deny to Philo the authorship of the work, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*. Z. Frankel¹ advanced several reasons against its genuineness, which are, however, of not much weight, because this work belongs to the purely philosophical treatises of Philo, which in their external form deviate slightly from his other writings. Frankel characterises the work in the following words:—"Upon close investigation it is seen that we have here the school exercise of a philosophical tyro. No original thought, no living exposition; only a piling-up of borrowed sentences and examples." This is quite correct, but is no proof against the Philonic authorship. It is a youthful work of Philo; this explains everything. The style, however, is already distinctively Philonic. Recently a fresh attempt has been made by R. Ausfeld² to disprove the authenticity of the work, but without result; he has been completely refuted by P. Wendland.³

¹ *Ueber Palæstinische und Alexandrinische Schriftforschung*, p. 32.

² *De Libro Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεῦθερον qui inter Philonis Alexandrini Opera fertur*. (Diss. Gottingæ, 1887.)

³ *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, Vol. I. (1888), pp. 509-517.

From similar reasons Z. Frankel had pronounced the treatise *De Æternitate Mundi* (Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου) unauthentic, and J. Bernays concurred in his opinion. Bernays' authority on such matters was so influential, that its unauthenticity was generally regarded as certain. Latterly, however, F. Cumont, in the *Prolegomena* to his edition (Berlin, 1891), has successfully defended the genuineness of this work. Its Philonic character can as little be denied as in the case of *Quod omnis probus liber sit*. The same character, too, marks the treatise *De Providentia*, the genuineness of which will be established by my friend, P. Wendland, in a book already in the press.¹

Unquestionably spurious is the little work *De Mundo* (Περὶ κόσμου), which is nothing but a compilation from various portions of the Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου, and of other Philonic works. The *De Sampson* and *De Iona*, discourses extant in Armenian, which have come by chance among the Philonic writings, also falsely bear the name of Philo.

What has chiefly been neglected hitherto is the text of Philo's works. Since Thomas Mangey—*i.e.*, for 150 years—no critical edition of Philo's works has been forthcoming. The few editions which have appeared since then are based mainly upon Mangey's text. Mangey's edition (two vols., London, 1742) was undeniably a great advance upon the *editio princeps* (Paris, 1553) of Adrianus Turnebus. For that which he accomplished for Philo the highest credit is due to him. He introduced a better order into the Philonic writings; he edited for the first time some works which were missing in Turnebus' edition; he compared, or caused to be compared, a number of important MSS., and partly by their help, and partly by means of his own shrewd conjectures, he emended the text in many places, and cleared it of mistakes; finally, he

¹ [It has just now appeared: *Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der nacharistotelischen Philosophie.* Von Paul Wendland, Berlin, 1892.]

first collected the fragments of the lost works, and for this purpose made use of the various *Catenæ* and *Florilegia*. But what progress has been made in science during the last 150 years! How greatly have literary aids increased, how much have methods improved, how differently is philological criticism now employed! Who can, therefore, wonder that Mangey's edition no longer suffices for our time; who will deny that an edition of Philo, which should answer every scientific demand of the present day, would necessarily present a very different appearance? MSS. must be more widely examined and utilised than was or could be done by Mangey, and in the estimation and employment of MSS. readings, a more methodical criticism must be followed. For the collection of fragments and the reconstruction of the lost writings much new and valuable material has been obtained, through the discovery of Armenian translations of Philo's works, through the researches into Church fathers, and among Christian anthologies.

The need of a new edition of Philo has been felt for a long time. More than sixty years ago, Grossmann (Professor of Theology at Leipsic) formed the plan of preparing a critical edition. Acting under his direction, the celebrated C. Tischendorf compared the Philonic MSS. in Paris and Italy. But Grossmann died in 1857, without having made as much as a commencement towards carrying his purpose into execution. Another theologian, Dr. Otto, took up the scheme, but he also died without having brought it to realisation. The two complete editions which have appeared in Germany in this century—the one under the charge of Richter (8 vols., Leipsic, 1828—1830); the other the stereotyped edition of Tauchnitz (8 vols., Leipsic, 1851—1853)—give in the main the text of Mangey's edition, and contain no other additional matter than the Latin translation of those works of Philo which were edited by Aucher from the Armenian. For the rest only a few writings have been edited in a separate form.

Tischendorf, in his *Philonea*,¹ upon the basis of a careful comparison of MSS., brought out a complete and improved text of two treatises, which were very imperfectly edited by Mangey, viz., the second book *De Specialibus Legibus*, and the treatise *De Posteritate Caini*. J. Bernays showed, in an ingenious treatise,² that in the work *Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου*, the order was disturbed through a displacement of the leaves, and he afterwards edited the text, restored according to its original sequence, and greatly improved.³ This work was recently again edited by F. Cumont, as is mentioned above. The Greek fragments of the books, either lost or only preserved in Armenian translations, but which are also met with in *Catenæ* or *Florilegia*, J. Rendel Harris has collected and edited.⁴ But he has not by any means used the whole material now at our disposal.

Now, at last, a new critical edition of the collected works of Philo is in course of preparation. The incentive thereto is due to the Berlin Academy of Sciences. The Academy gave as subject for a prize, in the year 1887, the critical treatment of Philo's book *De Opificio Mundi*, and at the same time expressed the wish that this work might lead to a new collected edition of Philo. Of the treatises sent in, two were considered worthy of the prize, that of Dr. P. Wendland and my own. My work⁵ appeared in the year 1889; it contains the amended text of the work *De Opificio Mundi*, with critical remarks, and an introduction dealing with the earlier editions, the MSS. used, and the language of Philo. Soon afterwards Wendland and I

¹ *Philonea, inedita altera, altera nunc demum recte ex vetere scriptura eruta.* (Leipsic, 1868.)

² *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1863, page 34, seq.

³ *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie d. W., philos.-hist. Classe*, 1876.

⁴ *Fragments of Philo-Judæus*, newly edited by J. Rendel Harris. (Cambridge, 1886.)

⁵ *Philonis Alexandrini libellus de opificio mundi.* Ed. Leopoldus Cohn (Vratislaviae, 1889.)

resolved to unite our studies, and to prepare together a critical edition of Philo's works. Since then we have spent all our free time in collecting critical material, and in making ourselves most intimately acquainted with all that has come down to us, directly or indirectly, of Philo. My friend Wendland worked chiefly in the Italian libraries; I myself compared the MSS. in Munich and Vienna, and for the same purpose stayed some time last year in Oxford and Paris. In Oxford, where I worked for four weeks in the Bodleian Library, I enjoyed, as I here wish gratefully to acknowledge, the kind assistance of Dr. Neubauer.

What important results were obtained from the investigation of the MSS. can be perceived in a few examples from Wendland's book published last year.¹ I will give a short summary of the contents of this book, attaching a few remarks to some points, and therewith close this survey. In the first place, a hitherto unknown text is published, which fills up a gap in Philo's work, *De Victimis*. This gap had not been noticed until then, although it is quite apparent. In *De Victimis*, § 3, Philo enumerates the offerings which were brought for the whole nation (or for the whole of mankind, as Philo adds), αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάγονται καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν, αἱ δὲ ταῖς ἐβδόμας, αἱ δὲ νομηνίαις καὶ ἱερομηνίαις, αἱ δὲ νηστεύαις, αἱ δὲ τρισὶ καιροῖς ἐορτῶν. Thereupon Philo speaks of the offerings which were brought daily (καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν), and of those that were brought on Sabbath (ταῖς ἐβδόμας); but then (§ 4) he passes over to another subject. Between § 3 and § 4 a section is obviously wanting, wherein the offerings on New Moon, New Year, Day of Atonement, and the Three Festivals were dealt with. This section is only preserved in one MS., which Wendland found in Florence. In it Philo expounds the sacrificial commands, Num. xxviii. 11—

¹ *Neu entdeckte Fragmente Philos nebst einer Untersuchung über die ursprüngliche Gestalt der Schrift de sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, von Paul Wendland. (Berlin, 1891.)

xxix. Some additions are derived from the parallel passages in Levit., such as the placing of the shewbread on the table on the Sabbath (Levit. xxiv. 6), the sacrifice as a peace-offering of two lambs on the Feast of Weeks (Levit. xxiii. 19), the two goats and the ram on the Day of Atonement (Levit. xvi. 5 *seq.*) As a whole the piece contains nothing but a paraphrase of the Biblical account, to which Philo, according to his custom, adds an allegorical or moral interpretation. In this he agrees occasionally with Palestinian exegesis, *e.g.*, he makes the twelve loaves of the shewbread have reference to the twelve months of the year (similarly Josephus *Antiq.* III. vii. 7). This interpretation does not seem to have been invented by Philo, for in the Jewish commentators of the Middle Age we find the shewbread connected with the twelve constellations (י"ב מזלות), which comes to the same thing. In another respect again Philo differs from the Palestinian Rabbins. The daily sacrifices he explains as thank-offerings (ὑπὲρ εὐχαριστίας ἐκάτερον, τὸν μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν μεθ' ἡμέραν, τὸν δ' ὑπὲρ τῶν νύκτωρ εὐεργεσιῶν, ἃς ἀπαύστως καὶ ἀδιαστάτως τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁ θεὸς χορηγεῖ.). According to the Rabbinic conception, which is based upon Job i. 5, they are sin offerings for unconscious transgressions.¹ As to his relation to the Halacha, the conclusion arrived at by Ritter in the above quoted work is here also confirmed. Philo agrees in the main with the Talmudic decisions, although differences are also to be found, which can be referred back to a difference in ceremonial practice followed by the Alexandrian Jews (and in the Onias temple, so far as the sacrificial ritual is concerned). Most of the sacrificial laws of the Bible, discussed in this section by Philo, are so clear that no dispute on them could arise even among the Rabbins. Only in regard to the sacrifice on the Feast of Weeks a contradiction exists between Num. xxviii. 27 and Levit. xxiii. 18, inasmuch as

¹ *Pesikta* ed. Buber, p. 55 b. תמיד של שחר מכפר על עונות שנעשו בלילה ותמיד של בין הערבים מכפר על עונות שנעשו ביום :

in Numbers two bullocks, one ram and seven lambs, and in Leviticus seven lambs, one bullock and two rams are commanded to be offered. In the Talmud¹ there is a discussion how this is to be understood; in the name of R. Akiba it is decided that both kinds of sacrifices were to be brought on Pentecost; that mentioned in Numbers as a festival offering (מוסף היום), and that in Leviticus on account of the bread which had to be offered as a firstling (בגלל הלחם הבכורים). Philo appears to know nothing of this Halachic decision. He simply ignores the contradiction between the two passages in the Bible, and mentions for Pentecost only the offering prescribed in Numbers. Another deviation from the Palestinian Halacha appears in § 15, where the first offering of the priest (Levit. vi. 13 *seq.*) is spoken of. The indistinctness of the language of the Bible in this passage led to a discussion among the Rabbins concerning the mode of the offering. In the Talmud a distinction is made between the high priest and the ordinary priest (כהן הדיוט). According to the Talmudic decision, the high priest brings the offering daily, commencing with the day of his anointing (חביתי כהן גדל), the ordinary priest only on that day when he performed the service for the first time (מנחת דינוך).² Philo also explains the biblical word רמיד (διὰ παντός LXX.) to mean that the offering had to be brought daily (καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν); but he does not make the distinction which the Rabbins make, but refers the ordinance to the priests generally (ἱερείς).

In the second chapter of his book Wendland gives the fragments of the lost portion of the work *De Ebrietate*, which originally consisted of two books. It was formerly disputed whether the *Περὶ μέθης* was the first or the second book. Wendland proves that it was the first, and then gives a collection of the fragments of the lost second book, with critical and exegetical notes. All these frag-

¹ Talm. Bab. Menachot, fol. 45, cf. Sifra on Lev. xxiii. 18.

² *Ib.*, fol. 51b, Sifra on Lev. vi. 12.

ments are to be found in a Christian Florilegium, which, in the MSS., is usually referred to Johannes Damascenus; Wendland uses the opportunity to give a review of the extant MSS. of this Florilegium (*Sacra Parallela*). The text of this Florilegium, which is of great importance to Philo and the older Church fathers, has not yet been edited in its complete form, and most of the MSS. have either been not at all or insufficiently utilised. Harris was the first, in his edition of the fragments of Philo, to turn an old Paris MS. to account. Still more valuable, however, are the so-called Codex Rupefucaldinus (which formerly belonged to the library of Sir Thomas Phillipps, in Cheltenham, and is now in Berlin), a Vatican MS., from both of which Wendland has made excerpts, and another Paris Codex which I have lately examined in Paris. The relation of the various MSS. to each other, and the origin of the whole work require to be more carefully investigated.

The third and longest chapter of Wendland's book is of special importance. Therein Wendland proves that Procopius of Gaza (sixth century) in his commentary on the Bible, which has been preserved in a Munich MS., largely made use of, and frequently copied verbally from, Philo's *Quæstiones* on Genesis and Exodus. As, moreover, the Greek anthologies of the middle ages contain many quotations from Philo, we are in a position to reconstruct to a considerable extent the original Greek text of the *Quæstiones in Genesim et Exodum*. In an essay of my own I have added a supplement to this important discovery of Wendland. Wendland himself had already shown that in many places where Procopius employs Philo's *Quæstiones*, as well as in the printed *Catena* to the Pentateuch (Leipsic, 1772), Philo is quoted, or obviously used; hence it follows that Procopius must stand in a certain relation to the *Catena*. But we know that Procopius himself compiled a *Catena*. Now in my essay I have shown that the printed *Catena*, which has been handed down anonymously in the MSS., was the work of no other than Procopius; the

commentary of the Munich MS. is only an extract from the Catena, in which there is a running explanation, and the names of the authors placed under contribution are omitted. As, moreover, Philo is frequently copied in the Catena, where he is not expressly mentioned by name, the gain to the text of the Quæstiones resulting from this discovery is a very important one. Unfortunately Procopius must have read the Quæstiones in the same imperfect condition as they assume for us in the Armenian translation.

In the fourth and fifth chapters Wendland discusses the relation of Theodoret and Origen to Philo. Both made use of him, but did not appropriate his explanations so literally as Procopius.

The sixth chapter treats of the original form of the work *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*. In the editions of Philo is to be found a small treatise *Περὶ τοῦ μίσθωμα πόρνῃς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν μὴ προδέχεσθαι*, concerning which there has been some doubt into which larger work it should be fitted. Wendland proves that it has no right to form an independent treatise, but that it is a patch-work of two pieces, which originally belonged to two different writings of Philo. The larger piece (§§ 2—4) stands in most, as well as in the best, MSS. in the middle of the treatise *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* (§ 5), and has there its appropriate place. The beginning (§ 1), which has been clumsily joined to the other piece, has its correct position in the work *De Victimis Offerentibus* (between § 4 and § 5), as a Florentine MS. testifies.

LEOPOLD COHN.
